

# UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

DATE:

April 2, 1987

Superfund Records Center

SITE: NEW BEDFORD

SUBJECT:

Review of Alternative Locations for the Confined Disposal Facility Portion of the Pilot Study

BREAK: 04.04

FROM:

for Douglas Thompson, Coordinator *Mat Schwab*  
Wetlands Protection Unit, Water Quality Branch

OTHER: 49711

TO:

Frank Ciavattieri, New Bedford Harbor Coordinator  
Waste Management Branch



SDMS DocID **49711**

I have reviewed the letter dated March 20, 1987 from the Corps of Engineers which evaluates several alternate locations for the confined disposal facility (CDF) portion of the proposed pilot study.

In accordance with the requirements of the EPA section 404(b)(1) guidelines, we recommend location E (shown on Figure 5) as the most desirable location for the construction of the CDF. This alternative, which avoids placement of fill in the harbor and loss of wetlands and aquatic habitat, would comply with section 230.10 of the guidelines which requires that adverse impacts on the aquatic ecosystem be avoided or minimized.

As described in the letter from the Corps, a 160,000 square foot diked area would be constructed on city owned land just south of the cove where the dredging will be performed. This offers several major advantages over all of the other alternatives, including:

- No temporary or permanent loss of aquatic habitat.
- No loss of flood storage.
- No disruption to flow patterns in the cove.
- Ease of construction and operation "in the dry".
- Shortened construction time.
- Possibility to complete the pilot study by the end of the calendar year.
- Possibility to do dredging in the fall which is more desirable than the summer months due to decreased biological activity.
- The CDF could be designed as a permanent facility avoiding future removal cost and the environmental impacts of removal.

The primary disadvantage of this alternative that has been cited by the Corps is its smaller size. Therefore, we recommend that its capacity be increased by excavating the present area. The excavated materials would very likely be acceptable for disposal at the city landfill since it contains primarily clean construction rubble. Alternatively, portions may be used to construct the dikes. The size of the proposed CDF may also be enlarged by constructing the dikes closer to the property lines or by obtaining additional private property.

The alternative location F (Figure 6) is the next most desirable alternative configuration for the CDF. This alternative, however, involves some loss of aquatic habitat and is therefore not as desirable as alternative location E. Its advantage is the additional capacity of this enlarged CDF.

- 2 -

We recommend that alternatives A, B, C, and D, be dropped from further consideration due to their more significant environmental impacts, and problems associated with construction and operation.

If you have any questions about these comments, please contact Ed Reiner at 5-3347.

cc: Ronald Manfredonia, Chief, Water Quality Branch